



## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING

21 Main Street

Thursday, March 26, 2026, at 6:30 PM

### MINUTES

---

#### AN OPEN MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD OF THE TOWN OF WARRENTON, VIRGINIA, WAS HELD ON MARCH 26, 2026

##### Regular Meeting

##### PRESENT

Mr. Michael Beidler, Chair; Mr. Steve Wojcik, Vice-Chair; Mr. William Hemmingson; Mr. John Scoggin; Mr. Tim Burch; Ms. Casey DeHaven, Planning Manager; Mr. Matthew Cute, Permit Technician

##### PRESENT VIA ELECTRONIC MEANS

##### ABSENT

---

#### REGULAR MEETING – 6:30 PM

Mr. Michael Beidler reads the purpose statement and calls the meeting to order at 06:30PM, a quorum is present, and business can be conducted.

#### NEW BUSINESS.

##### 1. COA 2026-5: 33 Culpeper Street

Request to install a new hanging sign with new bracket on building exterior.

Mr. Beidler introduces the application.

Ms. Elizabeth Fox, owner and applicant, comes forward to speak, providing an overview of the project.

Mr. Beidler asks for further details on the sign.

Ms. Fox goes into further detail for the sign and attachment method.

Mr. Beidler further clarifies with Ms. Fox.

Mr. Beidler opens the floor to questions.

Mr. Burch asks a about permits though audio is too low to determine exact details.

Ms. Fox responds, stating that she has been in contact with staff for that process.

Mr. Burch makes a further statement also not captured in the recording.

Mr. Beidler asks a clarifying question.

Mr. Burch clarifies his question and statement regarding the attachment method.

Ms. DeHaven comments that she has been in communication with other staff regarding permit process.

Mr. Wojcik asks about the potential for future signage for other commercial spaces in the building.

Ms. Fox responds outlining the other tenants and spaces available and their current plans for signage.

Mr. Wojcik asks for further information on the number of allowable signs per building.

Ms. DeHaven responds clarifying the allowable signage based on the zoning ordinance.

Ms. Fox advises that any additional signage would be submitted as a separate item.

Mr. Wojcik provides his thoughts on placement of any additional signage.

Ms. Fox advises that some of the potential tenants may not desire signage.

Mr. Hemmingson asks if this style of signage is considered two separate signs or a single sign.

Mr. Cute responds advising that the allowable size is calculated as if they were one sign.

Mr. Scoggin asks if another style of signage was entertained.

Ms. Fox responds, outlining the design process behind the design decisions.

Mr. Beidler suggests relocation of the signage to the second level to not obscure existing architecture.

Mr. Fox asks a clarifying question.

Mr. Beidler describes in further detail his proposed location and attachment method.

Ms. Fox indicates that she is amenable to the recommended changes.

Mr. Hemmingson agrees with Mr. Biedler's thoughts and adds an alternate location for supplementary signage.

Mr. Beidler asks for a motion.

Ms. Fox asks for further clarification of the proposed location.

Mr. Beidler further expands on his recommendation and potential to separate the two signs.

Ms. Fox expresses her concerns over the visibility of both signs if separated.

Mr. Beidler acknowledges her concerns and provides a revised recommendation.

Mr. Scoggin provides an alternate recommended location at the far-right edge of the building.

Mr. Scoggin moves to approve COA-26-5 with the recommended alterations to mounting style and location, Seconded by Mr. Burch.

Mr. Wojcik asks about any concerns with mounting a bracket to the stucco wall.

Ms. DeHaven responds, indication that staff follows the secretary of the interior's guidelines.

Mr. Hemmingson asks about the inclusion of additional supplementary signage.

Ms. DeHaven confirms that they would need to be included.

Mr. Beidler asks Ms. Fox for her thoughts on the supplementary signage.

Ms. Fox responds, providing her thoughts for the design and location.

Mr. Scoggin amends the motion including the addition of two smaller supplementary signs adjacent to the entryway door.

Discussion occurs as the motion is recorded.

Mr. Burch seconds the modified motion.

No further discussion.

The vote was as follows:

Ayes: Mr. Michael Beidler, Chair, Mr. Steve Wojcik, Vice Chair; Mr. William Hemmingson; Mr. John Scoggin; Mr. Tim Burch;

Nays:

Abstention:

Absent:

**COA 2026-5 Passed 5-0-0.**

---

## **UPDATES.**

No updates from staff.

---

## **BOARD MEMBERS TIME.**

Mr. Scoggin asks for clarification on an earlier comment regarding submitted permits.

Ms. DeHaven responds detailing the process for concurrent applications.

Mr. Burch clarifies his earlier comment.

Mr. Beidler clarifies the purpose of his earlier question.

Mr. Wojcik discusses a new house on the state historic registry and the possibility of expanding the local historic district.

Ms. DeHaven responds to the discussion about the house and the process for expanding the historic district.

Mr. Beidler asks about the role board members can have in that process.

Ms. DeHaven responds, providing some examples of potential involvement.

Mr. Wojcik discusses the potential correction to the VCRIS record for the Oak Springs historic property.

Ms. DeHaven advises the process to edit or request edits to the VCRIS record and the survey process.

Mr. Scoggin asks for clarification on the use of work sessions with applicants' vs pre-application meetings and how post meeting information is disseminated.

Mr. Cute advises that pre-application meetings aren't officially recorded meetings.

Ms. DeHaven provides a detailed explanation of the process and limitations in attendance.

Mr. Wojcik provides further details and historical precedents for the pre-app meetings.

Ms. DeHaven outlines the potential benefits of work sessions for more complex applications.

A brief discussion of the use cases for pre-application meetings occurs.

Mr. Scoggin asks for further clarification on the function and use cases for a work session.

Ms. DeHaven provides a brief example of the function and use case for a work session.

Mr. Wojcik provides further examples of previous work sessions.

Discussions on work sessions continue briefly.

Mr. Hemmingson adds his thoughts on the previous case being discussed and requests some information be sent to the board.

Mr. Beidler responds that the board was included in the communication with the requested list.

Mr. Cute responds that he believed that to be the case and provides additional context to Mr. Hemmingsons previous comment.

Mr. Beidler asks for clarification on the status of the application being discussed.

Mr. Cute provides the requested information.

A brief discussion of the application occurs.

Mr. Beidler recommends that board members reach out to staff with any question and include staff in communication between board members.

---

## **ADJOURNMENT.**

**Mr. Beidler moves to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Wojcik. There was no discussion.**

**With no further business, this meeting was adjourned at 7:20 PM on Thursday, March 26, 2026.**